

Sharon.01

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of Michael Sharon

Serial No. 10/755,161

Filed: 1/12/2004

For: Rotational Filing System
For Compact Disks

) Group Art Unit: 3611

) Examiner: Brian K. Green

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231AMENDMENT AND REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION AFTER FINAL
REJECTION OF THE CLAIMS

Sir:

This amendment is submitted in response to the August 30, 2005 Final Office Action to place the specification and finally rejected claims 11-12 and 14-15 in better condition for appeal per the Examiner's objections and to request reconsideration of their final rejection.

IN THE SPECIFICATION

At line 79 of page 4 delete "54-54" and substitute therefor "XIII-XII".

At line 122 of page 6 delete "seized" and substitute therefor "sized" and at line 130 of page 6 delete "are".

The Abstract of the Invention has been amended herewith in single paragraph

format on the accompanying sheet to address the Examiner's objection.

IN THE CLAIMS

Amend the following claims to address the Examiner's objections:

Claim 11.(currently amended) A rotational filing system for storing and retrieving a compact disk, comprising: a plurality of disk-shaped pouches and a means for support which rests on a horizontal surface, wherein each disk-shaped pouch included in said plurality of disk-shaped pouches is adjacent to one another and rotates about a common axis of said support means, each said disk-shaped pouch having at least one tab for including indicia in reference to [said] an associated compact disk and extending beyond the periphery of said associated compact disk. [.]

Claim 15.(currently amended) The disk-shaped pouch of claim 14 wherein said pouch has at least one center hole that is congruent to the center hole of said compact disk while said pouch contains said compact disk.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Reconsideration is requested of the rejection of claims 11-12 and 14-15 for the reasons set forth in the Applicant's response to the Office Action mailed on April 1, 2005 and the telephone interview with the Examiner of October 24, 2005 regarding claim 11. Reference is made to the prior art made of record by the Examiner in that Office Action and in the Final Rejection of Applicant's claims.

Neither the Reinhold patent nor the Balzer published application taken alone or in combination can provide the requisite motivation for the artisan to incorporate an indicia tab of Balzer extending from one side of the Reinhold record sleeve to arrive at the

BEST AVAILABLE COPY